

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The claims have been amended to obviate the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs. It is respectfully submitted that the claims as amended recite metes and bounds of the invention clearly and definitely. Furthermore, the claims are enabled by the specification. The terms photoprotective agents, dye fixative agents, soil repelling agents and soil release agents are well known in the detergent art and do not present any issues with indefiniteness or enablement. Applicants also note that micro-particles which are loaded with a benefit agent are the subject of applicants' examples and, therefore, no indefiniteness or non-enablement is apparent. In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 10, 12, 14 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Shoseyov, U.S. Patent 5,719,044.

The Examiner questioned applicants' last response to the previous Office Action:

"In response to the previous Office action, applicants have not presented any arguments against the above rejection. Under the remarks section applicants imply mention that "Claims 7, 9, 11 and 13 were not rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over either Shoseyov or Bettiol. Consequently those rejections are considered to be moot". It is highly unclear to the Examiner as to what applicants mean by the above statement. If claims 7, 9, 11 and 13 were not rejected, it is not clear as to how applicants can conclude that rejection of other claims is rendered moot."

Applicants respectfully note that in the previous Office Action, claims 7, 9, 11 and 13 were not rejected over Shoseyov. Applicants then incorporated the subject matter of claims 7, 9, 11 and 13 into claim 1. It was, therefore, considered that the rejection over

Shoseyov was moot since the subject matter of the claims which were not rejected was incorporated into claim 1.

Claim 1 still incorporates the subject matter of claims 7 and 13 which the Examiner had not rejected over Shoseyov. Applicants continue to maintain that the amended claims are not anticipated by Shoseyov. Specifically, Shoseyov does not teach or suggest any chemical equilibrium constant between the high binding antibody or fragment and the ligand that it binds to, or the equilibrium constant lower than  $10M^{-4}$ . Furthermore, Shoseyov does not teach or suggest the binding of the high binding antibody or fragment to a benefit agent or micro-particles loaded with a benefit agent. In light of the numerous differences between Shoseyov and the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection over Shoseyov should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Linder, cited by the Examiner for its teaching of T. Teeri species does not remedy the shortcomings of the Shoseyov with regard to independent claim 1, as discussed above. Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and therefore, is patentable for reasons stated above. Consequently, the rejection over Shoseyov in light of Linder should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

If a telephone conversation would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of the present application, applicants' undersigned attorney invites the Examiner to telephone at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,



Rimma Mitelman  
Registration No. 34,396  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

RM/sa  
(201) 840-2671